

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated September 19, 2008, pending claims 1, 13-15, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,447,070 issued to Inoue (“Inoue”). Claim 21 stands as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Inoue. Additionally, claims 2-8, 16-20, and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In light of the following amendments and arguments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

### **Inoue Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 13-15, and 22-23**

The Office Action at page 2 alleges that Inoue teaches all structural limitations of independent claims 1, 13, and 22. Although Applicant respectfully submits that Inoue does not teach a first lockable device, second lockable device, or king pin indicator as recited in claims 1, 13, and 22, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 22 to further prosecution of the present application.

Specifically, claims 1, 13 have been amended to include the limitation of a “locking bracket including a second lockable device lockable to said first locking device,” and claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to include a king pin indicator that prevents “said first and second lockable devices from being locked together.” Inoue does not teach either a locking bracket including a second lockable device lockable to a first locking device or a king pin indicator that prevents the first and second lockable devices from being locked together.

The Office Action at pages 2-3 alleges that Inoue teaches a first lockable device at rigid member 8, a second lockable device at edge abutment 3a and projections 2 and 14, and a king pin detector at hook 11. However, rigid member 8 is not connectable or lockable in any manner to edge abutment 3a or projections 2 and 14. (See FIGS 1 and 2 of Inoue). Moreover, hook 11

does not prevent the rigid member 8 and edge abutment 3a and projections 2 and 14 from being locked together. (See FIGS 1 and 2 of Inoue). Therefore, Inoue does not teach either a locking bracket including a second lockable device lockable to a first locking device, or a king pin indicator that prevents the first and second lockable devices from being locked together as required by claims 1, 13, and 22.

For the forgoing reasons, Inoue does not anticipate claims 1, 13, and 22, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 22 be withdrawn. Claims 14, 15, 23, and 24 all depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13, or 22; therefore, claims 14, 15, 23, and 24 all inherit the limitations of claims 1, 13, or 22. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14, 15, 23, and 24 also are not anticipated by Inoue and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

#### **Claims 21 Is Patentable Over Inoue**

Claim 21 depends directly from independent claim 13. As independent claim 13 has been amended to overcome the rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to be fully responsive to the objections and rejection set forth in the Office Action. Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, respectfully requests indication that claims 1-8 and 13-24 are allowable. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2008



Risto Pribisich  
Reg. No. 55,859  
McDonald Hopkins, LLC  
600 Superior Avenue, E.  
Suite 2100  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2653  
(216) 348-5427